

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20, and 21 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. Claims 1-4, 7-16, 18, 20, and 21 stand rejected, and the rejection was made final. Pursuant to 35 C.F.R. § 1.114(b)(1), Applicants are amending objected-to claims 5 and 17 to comply with requirements of form set forth in the final office action and are cancelling rejected claims 1, 7-11, 16, 18, 20, and 21. Applicant also requests entry of the above amendments to claims 2-4, 12, 13, and 15, which are being amended to depend from claims previously indicated allowable. Claims 12 and 13 are also amended to improve consistency with the antecedent basis provided in base claim 17. The requested amendment places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0163524 (Dutta). Claims 1, 8, and 11 are canceled. Claims 3 and 4 are amended to depend from objected-to claim 5, and claim 13 is amended to depend from objected-to claim 17. Claims 5 and 17 are in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 3, 4, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1, 11, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0122810 (Tsirkel). Claims 1, 11, and 16 are canceled.

Claims 1, 11, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Japanese Pat. Pub. No. 200364725 (Nose). Claims 1 and 11 are canceled. The requested amendment makes claims 13-15 depend from objected-to claim 17, so that claims 13-15 are patentable for at least the same reasons set forth below to show that claim 17 is patentable. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 2 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tsirkel in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2005/0051708 (Hotelling). Claim 2 and 12 are respectively amended to depend from objected-to claims 5 and 17, which are now in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tsirkei in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,870,567 (Funston). Claim 7 is canceled.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dutta in view of Funston. Claims 9 and 10 are canceled.

Claims 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Funston. Claims 18 and 20 are canceled.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nose. Claim 21 is canceled.

Claims 5, 6, and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim but were indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Claim 5 is amended to independent form including the limitations of canceled claim 1, and claim 17 is amended to independent form including the limitations of claims 11 and 16. Claim 6 is not amended, but in view of the amendment to claim 5, no longer depends from a rejected claim. In view of the above amendments, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 5, 6, and 17

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application including claims 2-6, 12-15, and 17.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO:

EQ 709 633 110 US

Respectfully submitted,



David Millers
Reg. No. 37,396

THE PATENT LAW OFFICES
OF DAVID MILLERS
6560 ASHFIELD COURT
SAN JOSE, CA 95120
PH: (408) 927-6700
FX: (408) 927-6701